

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the first Office Action mailed on May 20, 2004. Claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 17 and 22 have been amended and claims 3 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 25-30 stand withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement raised by Examiner. Claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 16-24 remain in the present application. Applicants note and appreciate Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 3, 8, 11, 15, 20 and 23. In view of the foregoing amendments, as well as the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in complete condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the application in this regard.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chisholm et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,557,265. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16-19, 21, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Geyer, U.S. Patent No. 3,871,810. While Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 17 and 22 to more sharply define the present invention over the prior art of record and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 13 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of dependent claims 3 and 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 13, and claims

depending therefrom, are allowable and the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejections of independent claims 5 and 10 as being anticipated by Chisholm et al., Applicants have amended each of these claims to recite that the laterally expanding flow channel is defined by a pair of opposite side walls (designated by numerals 38 in Fig. 9) and that the flow restrictor disposed within the flow channel is spaced from the pair of opposite side walls.

In contrast, the asserted "flow restrictor" of Chisholm et al. (i.e., Fig. 4, the horizontal sides of element 17) extends entirely between and is connected to the pair of side walls (Fig. 4, lateral sides of element 17) of the flow channel. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Chisholm et al. taken alone, or in combination with the other prior art of record, fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements recited in each of amended independent claims 5 and 10 and the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejections of independent claims 5, 10, 17 and 22 as being anticipated by Geyer, Applicants have amended each of these claims to recite that the flow restrictor has a height within the flow channel which increases along the substantial length of the flow restrictor. Support for this amendment is located at Page 9, lines 16-20 of the specification and in the Figures.

In contrast, the height of the flow restrictor in Geyer initially increases along a partial length of the flow channel as shown in Figs. 2 and 7-11. However,

the height of the flow restrictor in Geyer then decreases along the remaining length of the flow restrictor toward the flow outlet as shown in Figs. 2 and 12-15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Geyer taken alone, or in combination with the other prior art of record, fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements recited in each of amended independent claims 5, 10, 17 and 22 and the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 2, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18-21, 23 and 24 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 17 and 22, respectively, and further as each of these claims recites a combination of elements not taught or suggested by the prior art of record, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable as well.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing response including the amendments and remarks, this application is submitted to be in complete condition for allowance and early notice to this affect is earnestly solicited. If there is any issue that remains which may be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to resolve the same and expedite the allowance of this application.

Applicants do not believe that this response requires that any fees be submitted, however, if any fees are deemed necessary, these may be charged to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.



David R. Brinkman, Reg. No. 40,532

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 241-2324 - Voice
(513) 421-7269 - Facsimile